

String Phenomenology and the Cosmological Constant

S. P. de Alwis[†]

Physics Department, University of Colorado,
Boulder, CO 80309 USA

Abstract

It is argued that classical string solutions should not be fine tuned to have a positive cosmological constant (CC) at the observed size, since even the quantum corrections from standard model effects will completely negate any classical string theory solution with such a CC. In fact it is even possible that there is no need at all for any ad hoc uplifting term in the potential since these quantum effects may well take care of this. Correspondingly any calculation of the parameters of the MSSM has to be rethought to take into account the evolution of the CC. This considerably complicates the issue since the initial conditions for RG evolution of these parameters are determined by the final condition on the CC! The Anthropic Principle is of no help in addressing these issues.

PACS numbers: 11.25. -w, 98.80.-k;

[†] e-mail: dealwis@pizero.colorado.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

Much effort has been expended on trying to find constructions which yield solutions with a small positive cosmological constant (CC) in the context of recent work on flux compactifications of string theory. The motivation stems from the observation of a small positive CC. These classical string solutions are a good description at some high scale somewhat less than the string or Kaluza-Klein (KK) scale. But the observed cosmological constant is measured at cosmological scales, and clearly one needs to incorporate quantum effects before one can compare the CC of the effective theory coming from the string theory model, with the observed cosmological constant.

In this respect it is necessary to clear up some apparent confusion in the literature concerning the argument of Bousso and Polchinski (BP) and its relation to the concrete models of classical string solutions in which all the moduli are stabilized. The argument of BP proceeds from the following assertion: the measured cosmological constant Λ can be written, in the context of string theory, as the sum of two contributions

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_0 + \sum_i n_i^2 q_i^2. \quad (1)$$

Here the second term is the contribution of internal fluxes and the q_i are a set of charges and the n_i are a set of integers characterizing the set of fluxes through the various cycles of the internal space. Λ_0 (which is assumed to be negative) is the sum of all contributions except those coming from the fluxes - *in particular it is supposed to include all quantum corrections to the cosmological constant*. However the arguments of BP were not made in a context where the moduli were stabilized, and in any concrete context where this has been achieved, the corresponding formula including quantum corrections is much more complicated than what is indicated by (1).

Consider the case of type IIB compactifications. The work of many authors (see [1] for a recent review) led to the realization that the complex structure moduli and the dilaton could be stabilized by turning on internal fluxes. Then it was pointed out in [2] (KKLT) that with the inclusion of non-perturbative terms the Kaehler moduli could also be stabilized. However this calculation resulted in a minimum which was negative. KKLT then decided to raise this minimum by adding an uplifting term, originating from Dbar branes, in order to get a model with a positive cosmological constant. Subsequently many authors considered other mechanisms for uplifting AdS minima to dS minima [21].

However there clearly is no need to insist on getting a positive CC at the observed value from a classical string theory calculation, which can only give the initial conditions for an RG evolution down to the far infra-red. KKLT type calculations are essentially done in classical string theory (or rather its low energy supergravity (SUGRA) approximation) with some instanton corrections. Even though some attempts have been made to include α' corrections, the question of including the corrections coming from integrating down from the string/KK scale has not been seriously addressed. Instead what many authors have done is to start with a KKLT type model (or one of its variants) with the cosmological constant adjusted to the observed value. Then the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) parameters (Yukawa couplings, soft masses) are computed. The latter are then used as the initial conditions of an RG evolution down to the standard model scale.

What is ignored in these calculations is the fact that in going from the KK scale down to the TeV scale the cosmological constant also evolves - in fact (generically) it acquires corrections which are quadratic in the cutoff scale (quartic corrections are absent in a theory with equal numbers of bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom). In very special situations though it may be possible to make sure that these quadratic corrections are absent (see for example ([3]) and then the corrections are of order the supermultiplet splitting (TeV?) scale. Thus if one started with a model with a tiny positive CC at the observed value, one ends up with a cosmological constant which is at least at the TeV scale! Clearly such a calculation makes no sense.

It was in fact pointed out in [4] that at the classical string theory level what one needs to ensure is that the cosmological constant is at or below the TeV scale. One could very well have started with a negative CC at the classical level, and (provided that this minimum breaks supersymmetry (SUSY)) one could envisage (depending on the model) the subsequent evolution to produce positive contributions that could lift it up. Alternatively it is also possible to start with a classically SUSY (AdS) minimum of the moduli potential and then consider (provided this minimum was tuned to be at the TeV scale) an uplift coming from dynamics of some hidden matter sector as in [5]. One would still be left with the usual (broken SUSY) fine-tuning problem of the CC at the level of (at least) 1 part in 10^{60} . In any event it is important to realize that the simple cancellation posited in equation (1) is no longer valid. The quantum corrections are themselves dependent on the fluxes since the masses of the moduli and all matter couplings and masses and hence in particular the

splitting within supermultiplets (whatever the mechanism of SUSY breaking) are dependent on them.

There is an additional problem that to the author's knowledge has not been discussed in the literature. Suppose that a string theory construction of the standard model (or more likely the MSSM) is found. There is likely to be a large degeneracy in that the same MSSM states are likely to emerge from many different choices of internal manifolds and flux configurations. Let us call the set of values for any such choice β . The four dimensional moduli potential will depend on this choice i.e. $V = V(\Phi, \beta)$, where Φ are the moduli and the MSSM fields. The MSSM parameters i.e. the Yukawa couplings and the soft masses and the CC will therefore depend on β . Now in order to have any predictive power at all, one should be able to find at most a few values of β which give the observed CC and SM couplings, from which the MSSM parameters could then be computed. One might hope that the probability distribution on the landscape is highly peaked at such values of β . Then one could hope to compute the MSSM parameters and compare with experiments in the near future (assuming low energy SUSY is observed). But therein lies the problem. The allowed set of values β are not directly determined by the experimental value of the cosmological constant. In order to determine them one needs to evolve the observed value back to the ultra violet scale at which the classical CC is relevant. But this evolution depends on the states that are integrated out in between these two scales and which are in turn dependent on β . In other words what we have is a highly non-linear coupled problem.

In the following we elaborate on this.

II. ONE LOOP EFFECTIVE POTENTIAL

Using the Coleman-Weinberg [6] formula the effective potential upto one loop corrections is

$$V = V_c + \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \text{Str} M^2 \Lambda^2 + \frac{1}{64\pi^2} \text{Str} M^4 \ln \frac{M^2}{\Lambda^2} + \dots \quad (2)$$

Here V_c is the classical potential, the ellipses represent cutoff (Λ) independent terms, and

$$\text{Str} M^n \equiv \sum_i (-1)^{2J_i+1} m_i^n(\Phi), \quad (3)$$

where m_i is the (field dependent) mass of a particle with spin J_i . Note also that the quartic divergence is zero because its coefficient $\text{Str} M^0 = 0$ in a theory with equal numbers of bosonic

and fermionic degrees of freedom. Now if SUSY is softly broken then $\text{Str}M^2$ should be field independent. However there could still be a contribution to the cosmological constant of $O(m_{3/2}^2\Lambda^2)$ since the SUSY breaking supertrace is of the order of the gravitino mass [22]. In a string theory calculation of these one loop effects one would expect a similar formula to hold in the low energy limit with the cutoff replaced by the string scale [23].

The classical potential is (in Planck units $M_p^2 \equiv \frac{1}{8\pi G_N} = 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} V_c &= V_F + V_D. \\ V_F &= e^G (G_i G_{\bar{j}} G^{i\bar{j}} - 3), \\ V_D &= (f_R^{-1})^{ab} k_a^i k_b^j G_i G_j, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Here $G = K(\Phi, \bar{\Phi}) + \ln |W(\Phi)|^2$ is the Kaehler invariant combination of the Kaehler potential K and the superpotential $W(\Phi)$. Also $G_i = \partial_i G$, $G_{i\bar{j}} = \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} G$ is the Kaehler metric, and k_a is a Killing vector corresponding to some gauge symmetry generator labelled by the index a . Of course this general form of the potential is expected to be valid quantum mechanically as well, but the point is that the expression for the Kaehler potential K that one starts with is taken from a classical string theory calculation.

First assume that the classical potential has a minimum at $V_F = V_D = 0$. Now in (2) the coefficient of the quadratic term in the cutoff is given by

$$\text{Str}M^2(\Phi, \bar{\Phi}) = 2Q(\Phi, \bar{\Phi})m_{3/2}^2(\Phi, \bar{\Phi}). \tag{5}$$

Here $m_{3/2}^2 = e^K |W|^2$, and assuming for simplicity that SUSY is broken in some modulus direction T ,

$$Q(\Phi, \bar{\Phi}) = N_{tot} - 1 - G^T H_{T\bar{T}} G^{\bar{T}}. \tag{6}$$

Now we have from (4) and the assumption that the minimum has zero CC, $|G_T| \sim O(\sqrt{3})$. $H_{T\bar{T}}$ is generically of $O(1)$ (see eqn (8) for a definition). Then we see that for large values of N_{tot} (the total number of degrees of freedom in the effective theory) the quadratic contribution to the potential is positive. Of course it is not clear that we will have an extremum, leave alone a minimum, but clearly the possibility of getting a dS minimum exists!

Although $\text{Str}M^2$ needs to be independent of the MSSM fields in order to have soft supersymmetry breaking, it can still be a function of the moduli fields. In any case generically it is non-zero and gives an $O(m_{3/2}^2\Lambda^2)$ contribution to the cosmological constant. Under some

special circumstances [3] this could be zero, in which case the leading perturbative contribution would be of $O(\Delta m^4 \sim (1TeV)^4)$ where the last estimate follows from the observational bound on SUSY partners to the SM fields. In other words even under the most favorable circumstances the classical CC needs to be fine tuned to sixty decimal places. Note also that the above formulae are independent of the mode of transmission of supersymmetry breaking from a hidden sector to the visible sector. The general conclusion is valid for any mechanism for mediating supersymmetry breaking (including low energy mechanisms such as gauge mediation) since it depends only on the Coleman-Weinberg formula (2).

Actually the above formulae are valid only if the classical starting point is in flat space. To really be consistent one should recalculate these perturbative corrections around an arbitrary (curved) background. Below we will briefly review some aspects of such calculations and discuss some of the additional complications involved.

III. CURVED SPACE CALCULATIONS

The superpotential W cannot get perturbative corrections but the Kaehler potential can. Now in global supersymmetry the order parameter for supersymmetry breaking is $F_i = \partial_i W$ (i.e. the derivative of W with respect to any chiral scalar Φ^i) at the minimum, so that if the theory has no supersymmetry breaking minima classically, then perturbative corrections will not generate one (ignore D-terms for the moment). In local supersymmetry however the situation is more subtle. The (F-term) potential for chiral scalars can be rewritten as

$$V = e^K (F_i \bar{F}_{\bar{j}} K^{i\bar{j}} - 3|W|^2) \quad (7)$$

Here $K = K(\Phi_i, \Phi_{\bar{j}})$, $W = W(\Phi_i)$, $F_i = \partial_i W + \partial_i K W$ and $K_{i\bar{j}} = \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} K$ is the Kaehler metric. The order parameter F_i now involves both W and K , but since the latter is renormalized in perturbation theory, in general one would expect that the condition for supersymmetry $F_i = 0, \forall i$, could be affected in perturbation theory. Around a Poincare invariant vacuum (i.e one with zero cosmological constant (CC)) however this cannot happen. The reason is that for a flat space supersymmetry the two terms in V must cancel at the minimum which in effect means that the condition for supersymmetry is $\partial_i W = W = 0$ at the minimum. Then since W is not renormalized in perturbation theory, one cannot break supersymmetry. The other (and in fact the generic) possibility is anti-deSitter (AdS) supersymmetry where

$W|_0 \neq 0$ so that the cosmological constant is $V|_0 = -3e^K|W|^2$. Perturbative corrections around such a vacuum can in principle break supersymmetry.

Here we will consider only the leading, generically non-vanishing, quadratic divergence that arises in perturbation theory. This (as well as the log divergences and the finite terms to one loop) has been calculated for an arbitrary curved background [7][8] and gives the result

$$\delta L = \frac{\Lambda^2}{32\pi^2} \left[\frac{N+1}{2} r - 2(N-5)V - 2e^G \{ (N-1) - H^{i\bar{j}} G_i G_{\bar{j}} \} \right].$$

Here r is the Ricci scalar of space time and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{i\bar{j}} &= R_{i\bar{j}} + F_{i\bar{j}} \\ R_{i\bar{j}} &= \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \ln \det G_{m\bar{n}} \\ F_{i\bar{j}} &= -\partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} \ln \det \text{Re}[f_{ab}]. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Here $f_{ab}(z, \bar{z})$ is the gauge coupling function. Thus keeping only these quadratic divergences the one loop corrected Lagrangian can then be written as

$$L = \frac{\tilde{M}_p^2}{2} r - \tilde{V}.$$

Here $\tilde{M}_p^2 = (1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{32\pi^2} \frac{N+1}{2})$ is the corrected Plank mass and the corrected potential is

$$\tilde{V} = e^G [G_i (K^{i\bar{j}} - \beta H^{i\bar{j}}) G_{\bar{j}} - \{3 - \beta(N-1)\}] \tag{9}$$

with G being redefined by adding a constant $\alpha = 1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{16\pi^2} (N-5)$ and $\beta = \frac{\Lambda^2}{16\pi^2 \alpha}$. Indeed if the perturbative corrections are computed with a regularization scheme which preserves the (local) supersymmetry of the action, then one should be able to write it in the same form as the classical potential,

$$\tilde{V} = e^{\tilde{G}} (\tilde{G}_i \tilde{G}^{i\bar{j}} \tilde{G}_{\bar{j}} - 3). \tag{10}$$

Here $\tilde{G} = G + \delta K$ where the second term is the perturbative correction to the Kaehler potential. This can be computed from the corrections to the kinetic terms of the chiral scalars of the theory. In fact reference [8] does give expressions for the latter. However it is far from obvious how to express the potential in the above form if one assumed that the calculations of [8] respected the SUGRA symmetry. So we will simply continue to work with (9) since we are only interested in the qualitative and order of magnitude effects of these corrections [24], but will assume that there is a correction to the Kaehler potential that guarantees the validity of (10).

IV. CALCULATING MSSM PARAMETERS

To calculate MSSM parameters one expands the Kaehler potential and the superpotential in terms of the MSSM fields ϕ^i ,

$$K = \hat{K} + \tilde{K}_{i\bar{j}}\phi^i\bar{\phi}^{\bar{j}} + Z_{ij}\phi^i\phi^j + \dots, \quad (11)$$

$$W = \hat{W} + \mu_{ij}\phi^i\phi^j + Y_{ijk}\phi^i\phi^j\phi^k + \dots \quad (12)$$

The coefficients of the powers of the MSSM fields are functions of (the stabilized values of) the hidden (moduli) sector fields. Let us go to a basis in which $\tilde{K}_{i\bar{j}} = \tilde{K}_i\delta_{ij}$. The Yukawa couplings and the soft terms of the canonically normalized fields are [9, 10],

$$\hat{Y}_{ijk} = Y_{ijk} \frac{\tilde{W}}{|\tilde{W}|} e^{\hat{K}/2} (\tilde{K}_i \tilde{K}_j \tilde{K}_k)^{-1/2} \quad (13)$$

$$A_{ijk} = F^m (\hat{K}_m + \partial_m (\ln Y_{ijk} - \ln(\tilde{K}_i \tilde{K}_j \tilde{K}_k))) \quad (14)$$

$$m_i^2 = m_{3/2}^2 + V_0 - F^m \bar{F}^{\bar{n}} \partial_m \partial_{\bar{n}} \ln \tilde{K}_i \quad (15)$$

$$M_a = \frac{1}{2} (\Re f_a)^{-1} F^m \partial_m f_a \quad (16)$$

These expressions are supposed to be valid at some high scale - presumably somewhat below the string or KK scale. What is usually done is to use these in a model where the classical CC has been fine-tuned to be close to zero and positive by one or other mechanism, such as adding the uplift terms of the original KKLT model or D terms. Then the physical predictions are supposed to be obtained by running these down to the MSSM scale by using the RG equations.

This procedure is however not meaningful. It is simply incorrect to ignore the running of the cosmological constant, which generically runs quadratically as was discussed in section II. In fact it is the final CC (at the largest scales) which has a measured value at the $10^{-3}eV$ scale. The problem is that this final condition has to be used to determine the initial conditions that are needed to evolve the MSSM parameters!

To be concrete let us assume that a model with three generations and the standard model gauge group has been found with the moduli stabilized by a combination of fluxes and non-perturbative terms as in the KKLT model. Let us denote the set of stringy parameters (data on the internal manifold and the fluxes) by β . This set determines the moduli potential and hence in particular the cosmological constant and the coefficients in (11)(12). What is usually done [11][12][13][14][15][16] following the original arguments of [9, 10] is to tune the

CC to be zero (or positive and small) by an appropriate choice of β . However as we argued in section II if one tuned the CC at this high scale to be small, one would get a large CC at the MSSM scale (and below).

Thus a meaningful calculation of the MSSM parameters must have a starting point, which at the classical string level has a CC which is tuned such that the final CC, including all quantum corrections, is in accordance with observation. This is of course the well-known non-trivial part of the fine-tuning problem of the CC. In the context of classical string solutions of the landscape this problem takes on the following aspect. In terms of RG evolution the condition on the CC is a final condition (looking at the flow as one from the UV to the IR). In other words finding the set of allowed β means solving an equation of the form (as we discussed in section III the actual condition is even more complicated)

$$V_{eff,0}(\beta) = V_{c,0}(\beta) + \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \text{Str} M^2(\beta) \Lambda^2|_0 + \frac{1}{64\pi^2} \text{Str} M^4(\beta) \ln \frac{M^2(\beta)}{\Lambda^2}|_0 + \dots \simeq O((10^{-120})) \quad (17)$$

where the last estimate is written in Planck units. Here V_c denotes the classical potential, V_{eff} denotes the quantum effective potential and the subscript 0 denotes evaluation at the minimum of the effective potential. Fixing this final value within experimental errors will lead to a large subspace of values of β that is not only (generically) going to be much larger than the subspace that yields a classical CC that is within the bounds, but is also much harder to determine. This is because the inverse RG problem depends on knowing the supermultiplet splittings which of course are dependent on the set β . Once this space of β is determined the initial value space for the RG evolution can be determined and then one could calculate for each point in this space the corresponding MSSM parameters at the relevant scale. Needless to say this appears to be a rather intractable problem!

The point is that quantum corrections, should not be expected to cancel amongst themselves barring some miracle. Let us try to estimate them. From (17) we see that

$$\delta V|_0 \equiv \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \text{Str} M^2 \Lambda^2|_0 + \frac{1}{64\pi^2} \text{Str} M^4 \ln \frac{M^2}{\Lambda^2}|_0 + \dots = O(10^{-46}). \quad (18)$$

In the last step we have made an estimate of the typical value of the radiative corrections after supersymmetry breaking by taking the cutoff to be at an intermediate scale at 10^{-8} as in many popular models (see for example [16]) and estimating the squared mass splitting in typical SUSY multiplets to be around a $TeV^2 = 10^{-30}$, from the lower limit on SUSY partners. This means that in order to get the observed value (barring some highly unlikely

cancellation of the quantum effects among themselves) one needs a classical value $V_c|_0 \sim O(10^{-46})$. Even the most conservative estimate of this (for instance in those models where the quadratic divergence is absent) gives a value $O(10^{-60})$ which is 60 orders of magnitude larger than the value of the observed CC.

On the other hand one might ask whether the problem of the CC can be decoupled from the calculation of the MSSM parameters. In other words if we calculate the latter after tuning the CC at the classical level to the observed value and ignore the quantum corrections to the CC, can we get MSSM parameter values that are approximately correct. This is what is typically assumed in the literature. However the point is that the classical Kaehler potential K AND superpotential W for a theory tuned (i.e. β chosen) such that (17) is satisfied, will in general be very different from that in a theory in which the classical potential by itself is tuned to satisfy the observational constraint. There is no perturbative relation between the two sets of K 's and W 's. They are obtained in different flux sectors and there is no reason at all to think that even qualitative predictions obtained with the latter theory will be obtained also in the former theory.

The essential point can be summarized as follows. Suppose the tuning $V_c(\beta)|_0 = O(10^{-120})$ yields a subspace $\mathcal{L}_c$ of the landscape $\mathcal{L}$ i.e. $\beta = \beta_c \in \mathcal{L}_c \subset \mathcal{L}$. On the other hand the tuning $V_{eff,0}(\beta) = O(10^{-120})$ will yield $\beta = \beta_{eff} \in \mathcal{L}_{eff} \subset \mathcal{L}$. Barring accidental cancellations that would make the quantum corrections in formulas such as (18) of the order of the observed CC, one should expect that $\mathcal{L}_{eff} \cap \mathcal{L}_c = 0$. There is absolutely no reason to expect in general that $\tilde{K}_{eff,i}(\beta_{eff})$ and $W(\beta_{eff})$ with $\beta_{eff} \in \mathcal{L}_{eff}$ are approximately equal (respectively) to $\tilde{K}_{ci}(\beta_c)$, $W(\beta_c)$, with $\beta_c \in \mathcal{L}_c$. It should be emphasized here that the values β , enter the formulae for the MSSM parameters both directly, and indirectly through the dependence of the moduli at the minimum on them. Thus the values of the measurable quantities (13,14,15,16) in the quantum theory are likely to be very different from the values obtained in the theory with the cosmological constant tuned to zero in the classical theory.

Actually even if one knew the set of β_{eff} defined in the previous paragraph it still does not make sense to compute the soft terms with the classical value of the Kaehler potential. Thus consider the effective quantum potential $V(K_{eff}, W(\beta_{eff}))$, where $K_{eff} = K_c + \delta K$ (the second term includes both perturbative and non-perturbative corrections). The superpotential W is of course not supposed to be renormalized in perturbation theory but contains

non-perturbative effects as in KKLT. The physical cosmological constant is then

$$V_{eff,0} \equiv V(K_{eff}, W(\beta_{eff}))|_0 = V(K_c, W(\beta_{eff}))|_0 + \delta K \cdot \frac{\delta V}{\delta K} + O(\delta K^2) \sim (10^{-3} eV)^4 \quad (19)$$

However as we've argued earlier the second term is generically around 75 orders of magnitude larger than the observed CC and has to be cancelled by a classical term which is of the same order. Thus the corrections to the Kaehler potential have to be of the same order as the classical Kahler potential and these corrections will give corrections to the soft masses and couplings calculated from the classical term that are not suppressed. In fact it is clear from the above analysis what the basic (hidden) assumption that is made in typical string phenomenology calculations is. It is that (at least for small fluctuations around the relevant minimum)

$$V(K_c, W(\beta_c)) \simeq V(K_{eff}, W(\beta_{eff})). \quad (20)$$

Note that in the above not only is the Kaehler potential on the right hand side the quantum corrected one, but also the superpotential is evaluated at a different set of internal data. If indeed (20) is true, then the calculations made with the classical Kaehler potential (tuned so that minium is the observed CC) will be in agreement with that made with the effective potential tuned so that its minimum is the observed CC). Unfortunately there is no a priori justification for this assumption!

Given that there is no gurantee that (20) is correct it is not clear that even qualitative predictions will survive. Except under the very special circumstances discussed earlier, the only ones that can be expected to survive are those that can be shown to be independent of the flux parameters β and the Kaehler potential. Thus models in which certain Yukawa couplings vanish (irrespective of the values of the fluxes) will retain this feature in the full quantum theory upto (small?) non-perturbative corrections. Unfortunately it is difficult to find any other classical predictions that can survive the tuning of the CC in the effective quantum theory after supersymmetry is broken.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this note was to bring together certain well-known facts which are central to understanding the relevance of string theory to physics at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC). The most important of these is the universally acknowledged but (in the context

of KKLT models) universally ignored fact that the CC undergoes quantum corrections [25]. The BP argument [17] of course tried to take the latter into account, but as we pointed out this is not relevant to what happens in concrete string theory situations exemplified by KKLT type constructions. We have argued that since these are essentially classical arguments (with the addition of some non-perturbative corrections in the type IIB case) it is not meaningful to demand that the value of the minimum of the potential be at the observed value of the CC. Even if one is to make qualitative predictions or statistical ones (as advocated by Douglas and collaborators [18]) one has to face up to the fact that the quantum effects can completely change any classical predictions, essentially because of the cosmological constant problem. Clearly the Anthropic Principle is of no use in resolving this issue.

Finally it should be noted that if a dynamical principle selected one or a few vacua (perhaps after imposing some criteria such as the dimensionality of space and the number of generations and the standard model gauge group) then one can proceed in the top down fashion to calculate for these models both the cosmological constant and the MSSM parameters. This was of course the hope of string theorists until very recently. The point of this note is merely to argue that if such a principle does not exist, then it is unlikely that top-down approaches have any relevance for phenomenology.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Ralph Blumenhagen, Oliver DeWolfe and especially Jan Louis for discussions and comments on the manuscript. I also wish to thank the latter for hospitality at DESY/ ITP-University of Hamburg and Dieter Luest for hospitality at the Max-Planck Institute, Munich, and the Aspen Center for Physics where this work was completed. In addition I would like to thank Peter Nilles, Fernando Quevedo, Graham Ross and other participants at the String Phenomenology workshop at KITP for discussions on the revised version. I also wish to thank the Perimeter Institute and DOE grant No. DE-FG02-91-ER-40672 for partial support.

[1] M. Grana, Phys. Rept. **423**, 91 (2006), hep-th/0509003.

- [2] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. Linde, and S. P. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 046005 (2003), hep-th/0301240.
- [3] S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas, and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. **B429**, 589 (1994), hep-th/9405188.
- [4] R. Brustein and S. P. de Alwis, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 126006 (2004), hep-th/0402088.
- [5] K. Intriligator, N. Seiberg, and D. Shih, JHEP **04**, 021 (2006), hep-th/0602239.
- [6] S. R. Coleman and E. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 1888 (1973).
- [7] R. Barbieri and S. Cecotti, Z. Phys. **C17**, 183 (1983).
- [8] M. K. Gaillard and V. Jain, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 1951 (1994), hep-th/9308090.
- [9] V. S. Kaplunovsky and J. Louis, Phys. Lett. **B306**, 269 (1993), hep-th/9303040.
- [10] A. Brignole, L. E. Ibanez, and C. Munoz (1997), hep-ph/9707209.
- [11] M. Grana, T. W. Grimm, H. Jockers, and J. Louis (2003), hep-th/0312232.
- [12] P. G. Camara, L. E. Ibanez, and A. M. Uranga (2003), hep-th/0311241.
- [13] D. Lust, S. Reffert, and S. Stieberger, Nucl. Phys. **B706**, 3 (2005), hep-th/0406092.
- [14] K. Choi, A. Falkowski, H. P. Nilles, and M. Olechowski, Nucl. Phys. **B718**, 113 (2005), hep-th/0503216.
- [15] B. C. Allanach, F. Quevedo, and K. Suruliz, JHEP **04**, 040 (2006), hep-ph/0512081.
- [16] J. P. Conlon, F. Quevedo, and K. Suruliz, JHEP **08**, 007 (2005), hep-th/0505076.
- [17] R. Bousso and J. Polchinski, JHEP **06**, 006 (2000), hep-th/0004134.
- [18] M. R. Douglas, Comptes Rendus Physique **5**, 965 (2004), hep-th/0409207.
- [19] K. Choi, J. E. Kim, and H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1758 (1994), hep-ph/9404311.
- [20] K. Choi, J. S. Lee, and C. Munoz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 3686 (1998), hep-ph/9709250.
- [21] For a list of references see [1].
- [22] Note that this is true irrespective of the mode of supersymmetry breaking. It just follows from formula 5 below.
- [23] There is a complication here that we will ignore. This comes from the fact that the Planck scale to string scale ratio is actually a modulus.
- [24] It should be noted that (9) is in agreement with equations (1.1) and (1.13) of [3] upto the constant shift of G .
- [25] For an early (pre-landscape) attempt to incorporate this into the calculation of MSSM parameters see [19, 20]. But these works do not take into account the fact that any attempt to fine tune the CC at the quantum effective level changes the fine tuning parameters and thus can in

general completely change both the Kaehler and the superpotential from the classically tuned values.